

Name of Applicant: Emma Donnan

Overall Ranking: 83 out of 100

I. PROJECT ABSTRACT (Up to 5 POINTS)			
0 points Abstract not provided or does not address any required elements (i.e., student needs; participants to be served; activities; outcomes; or key personnel)	1-2 point range Only includes 1-2 required elements (i.e., student needs; participants to be served; activities; outcomes; or key personnel)	3-4 point range Includes 3-4 required elements (i.e., student needs; participants to be served; activities; outcomes; or key personnel). Points reduced if exceeds two pages.	5 points Includes all 5 required elements (i.e., student needs; participants to be served; activities; outcomes; or key personnel). Points reduced if exceeds two pages.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3			
Comments: The one-page Abstract did not contain details pertaining to all five of the required components (e.g., key personnel) to secure full points in this section. Points were also deducted, as the application did not include a description related to how this program would expand the current programming at Emma Donnan.			

II. COMPETITIVE PRIORITY POINTS			(Up to 10 POINTS)
A. Required Descriptions (Up to 2 Points)			
0 points Descriptions not provided	1 point Just one of the two required descriptions provided (how application priority is met, OR origin of partnership)	2 points Both descriptions provided (how priority is met, <u>and</u> origin of partnership)	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.6			
Comments: Applicant met the competitive priority but contained limited information pertaining to the origin of the partnership between the organization partners.			
B. Organizational Priority Points (Up to 4 Points)			
0 points Does not meet criteria		4 points Applicant meets criteria	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4			
Comments:			
C. Programming Priority Points (Up to 4 Points)			
0 points Does not meet criteria		4 points Meets criteria & area listed in Section V Goals & Objectives	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4			
Comments:			

Section II Total (averaged) Points out of 10 Possible: 9.6

III. NEED FOR PROJECT (Up to 5 POINTS)			
A. Data Evidence Demonstrating Need (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points Data evidence not presented	1 point Data not provided for all three areas (i.e., achievement, demographics and behavioral)	2 points All three areas addressed (i.e., achievement, demographics & behavioral) and presented for EACH school to be served	3 points Achievement, demographic & behavioral data shown for EACH school (Attachment B) <u>and</u> demonstrates high need -- in both poverty levels and academic achievement.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.6			
Comments: Behavioral data were not disaggregated and reported <i>by school</i> .			

B. Demonstrate Expanded Out-of-School Time Programming (Up to 1 Point)	
0 points: Chart/graphic not provided	1 point: Chart/graphic provided showing increased time that addresses gaps for each school
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1	
Comments:	
C. Describe Process for Assessing Needs/Services (Up to 1 Point)	
0 points: Process and/or partner involvement not described	1 point: Process and partners involved are clearly described
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1	
Comments:	

Section III Total (averaged) Points out of 5 Possible: 4.6

IV. PARTNERSHIPS/COLLABORATIONS				(Up to 5 POINTS)
A. Describe Collaboration with Other Agencies/Funding Streams (Up to 1 point)				
0 points: Not addressed or too vague to award point		1 point: Applicant demonstrates collaboration with other agencies, e.g., Title I, Child Nutrition, TANF, State/local programs		
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1				
Comments:				
B. Describe How Each Partner’s Contribution Supports Program (Up to 1 point)				
0 points: Attachment F not submitted		1 point: Applicant completed and submitted Attachment F		
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = .666				
Comments: Attachment F provided for only one partner.				
C. Memorandum of Understanding for Applicant & Key Partners (Up to 3 Points)				
0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points	
MOU/s detailing partner roles & responsibilities not provided. <i>NOTE: This is <u>in addition</u> to Attachment F.</i>	At least one MOU provided in Appendix, but does not fully articulate roles & responsibilities between applicant & partner	MOU/s provided in Appendix for <u>all key partners</u> offering <i>basic info</i> relevant to applicant/partner roles	MOU/s provided in Appendix for <u>all key partners</u> providing clearly-articulated expectations for applicant and for partner	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.6				
Comments:				
The MOU for the Urban League (lead partner) was clear and articulated detailed descriptions of expectations and responsibilities. However, there were no other MOUs in the application packet for the remaining proposal partners. The narrative was the sole source of information relevant to partnerships.				

Section IV Total (averaged) Points out of 5 Possible: 3.3

V. PROGRAM DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION (Up to 30 points)
A. Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, Activities and Assessments (Up to 8 points)

2018–Cohort 9 RFP: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, August 2018

0-2 point range Table overviewing Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, Activities & Assessments includes <i>less than all three</i> of the <u>required goals</u> , i.e., (1) student achievement, (2) behavioral, & (3) family involvement	3-6 point range Includes all three required goals, i.e., achievement, behavioral and family involvement -- as well as HS, pre-K, or summer goals, <i>if applicable</i> . At least <u>two objectives</u> provided <u>per goal</u> . Activities are aligned with each objective; performance measures include numerical targets and are each connected to a specific measurement strategy	7-8 point range <i>Includes all three required goals, i.e., achievement, behavioral and family involvement -- as well as HS, pre-K, or summer goals, if applicable.</i> At least <u>two objectives</u> provided per goal. Highly engaging activities are aligned with objectives; challenging performance measures include numerical targets and are each connected to a specific measurement strategy
--	--	---

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **5.3**

Comments: Three required goals were provided—with two or more objectives for each (appear appropriate, with more than one assessment tool used to measure performance). However, goals were not specifically provided for the summer programming component (operating per Attachment D) and the STEM performance measure is missing a numerical target.

B. Evidence of Previous Success (Up to 2 points)

0 points Information not provided in APPENDIX .	1 point If previous grantee : Some description of previous attendance rates and program benefits. If new grantee : Limited information on supporting student retention; and general strategies for providing academic assistance.	2 points If previous grantee : Clearly documented quantitative evidence of past 30+ and 60+ attendance rates and academic outcomes (e.g., ISTEP+, DIBELS, NWEA) showing increased performance. If new grantee : Specific activities provided to support student recruitment and attendance and to provide academic assistance.
--	--	---

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1.6**

Comments: Presentation of information was occasionally unclear and inconsistent.

C. Design Requirements (Up to 20 total points for Items 1-8)

C-1. Requirements of GEPA 427 (Up to 1 point)

0 points Information not provided in the APPENDIX or within proposal narrative.	1 point Specific equity issue identified and addressed (either in Appendix or proposal narrative) to reduce program barrier
---	---

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

C-2. Targeted Students and Their Families (Up to 3 points)

1 point Only partial information provided (i.e., only Attachment B <i>List of Schools</i> submitted; OR only narrative supporting criteria & process to recruit students provided). <i>If List of Schools (Attachment B) not submitted, zero points.</i>	2 point Identifies Title 1 and non-Title 1 schools (Attachment B); and describes (in narrative) general strategies for recruiting students. Justifies inclusion of any schools with less than 40% poverty (<i>if applicable</i>).	3 points Submits Attachment B (identifying schools). Narrative describes specific strategies for recruiting students; and justifies inclusion of schools with less than 40% poverty (<i>if applicable</i>). Majority of served schools demonstrate HIGH NEED (e.g., D/F schools; poverty rates greater than 50%)
--	---	--

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **3**

Comments:

C-3. Dissemination of Information (Up to 2 points)

0 points Information not provided	1 point Outlines general steps the applicant will take to disseminate general program information.	2 points Provides specific steps to disseminate detailed program information including: service description, program location, and how to access the program.
---	--	---

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1.6**

Comments:

Clarity needed in terms of how stakeholders are able to access the program.

C-4. Communication with Schools (Up to 3 Points)			
1 point <i>Less than all four topics are addressed (nonpublic students; accessing academic records; sharing student progress; and alignment of in-school and out-of-school-time efforts). Zero points if none of 4 topics.</i>		2 points <i>All four topics are addressed (nonpublic students; accessing academic records; sharing student progress; and alignment of in-school and out-of-school-time efforts)</i>	
3 points <i>All four topics addressed; <u>and</u> applicant demonstrates its strong understanding and commitment to appropriately obtain & use student data to inform efforts (e.g., specifies strategies for sharing information with teachers & parents; detailed MOU included in Appendix -- if applicant is not an LEA).</i>			
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.6			
Comments: A strong understanding of confidentiality of records is not presented here.			
C-5. Parental Involvement, Family Literacy, and Related Family Educational Attainment (Up to 3 points)			
0 points Information not provided	1 point Plan describes at least one, solid activity to engage parents in the program.	2 points Evaluation of community needs/resources conducted; <u>and</u> multiple activities planned to engage parents	3 points Evaluation of needs/resources conducted; <u>and</u> multiple activities specified to engage parents; <u>and</u> needs of working parents considered.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.3			
Comments: The needs of working families are not explicitly addressed here.			
C-6. USDA Approved Snacks/Meals for 21st CCLC Participants (Up to 2 points)			
0 points Information not provided – or Applicant does not offer (optional) snacks/meals to program participants	1 point <u>Only one</u> of two required elements provided (i.e., how snacks/meals will be acquired & distributed to sites; OR specification that snacks/meals meet USDA and IDOE guidelines		2 points <u>Both</u> required elements included: how snacks/meals will be acquired & distributed; <u>and</u> that snacks/meals meet USDA and IDOE guidelines
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2			
Comments:			
C-7. Weekly Schedule (Up to 5 points)			
0 points Information not provided	1-3 point range General weekly schedule provided that meets minimum hours of operation requirements for grade levels served. Applicant intends to also operate during summer OR extended-breaks, but did not submit separate weekly schedule.		4-5 point range Detailed weekly schedule provided for EACH site that meets minimum hours of operation requirements; Elem & MS schedules reflect diverse and engaging activities (academic, behavioral, enrichment/recreational); Separate schedules are provided for summer and extended breaks (if applicable).
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3.6			
Comments: Applicant indicates that they will offer a summer program, but the required separate summer schedule is not presented here.			
C-8. 21st CCLC Learning Center Messaging (Up to 1 point)			
0 points No description for meeting the requirement		1 point Applicant describes how it will meet the requirement	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1			
Comments:			

Section V Total (averaged) Points out of 30 Possible: 24

VI. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Up to 5 POINTS)			
0 points Information not provided	1-2 points range Includes one-dimensional description and plan for providing PD (e.g., focus is solely on staff attendance at State and national meetings or conferences – but no PD plan is articulated to support specific needs of center’s staff, aligned to its program goals & objectives)	3-4 point range Includes detailed plan for providing PD; connects PD to program quality and goals of project; PD strategies center around State/national workshops and trainings, but also include anticipated trainings (e.g., First Aid, vendor-provided trainings to support staff use of software instructional programs). May include a detailed chart of planned PD activities.	5 points Needs of program staff assessed and PD is a tiered-approach, addressing needs of specific staff roles (i.e., leadership vs. instructional needs). Multiple approaches will support needs (State & national workshops/conferences; <u>and</u> ongoing trainings to support locally-identified needs). Plan addresses initial kick-off, turn-over and ongoing training for new and veteran staff; connects PD to program quality and goals of the project; includes detailed chart of planned PD activities.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4			
Comments: A chart showed PD aligned to the goals and objectives of applicant’s programming, however, some additional PD mentioned that is not fully explained.			

VII. EVALUATION				(Up to 15 POINTS)	
A. Identification of Local Evaluator (Up to 3 points)					
1 point Applicant intends to hire local evaluator, but entity not yet selected		2 points Local evaluator identified (external to the program) with evaluation experience		3 points Selected local evaluator with demonstrated expertise in data analyses, report writing, <u>and</u> afterschool program knowledge	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3					
Comments:					
B. Evaluation Design (Up to 10 points)					
0-2 point range Plan is not provided -- or of insufficient detail to convey understanding of local evaluation expectations		3-5 point range Some key elements are included in local evaluation design plan, but several descriptions are missing or vaguely presented		6-8 point range Plan demonstrates understanding of expectations – with some key elements better articulated than others. Applicant must address all Section V performance measures & assessments to score in this range (or higher).	
9-10 point range Plan clearly articulated. Includes evaluator’s roles; addresses collection/analyses of all Section V performance measures & assessments; details eval implementation timeframes; and specifies how findings are shared and used to improve program					
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 9.6					
Comments:					
More specificity needed in describing who is responsible for gathering data.					
C. Annual Reporting (Up to 2 points)					
0 points Information not provided. Applicant does not address its obligation to submit reports/data for both State and federal reporting		1 point Applicant adequately addresses at least one key annual reporting obligation, e.g., local program evaluator’s report submitted to IDOE at end of each program year (showing program quality evidence, attendance trends and progress toward performance measures)		2 points Applicant understands its obligation to submit reports/data to the IDOE (i.e., annual local program evaluator’s report with program quality evidence, attendance trends and progress toward performance measures; <u>and</u> data required in EZ reports). Grantee also uses IN-QPSA online self-assessment, to locally rate its performance.	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2					
Comments:					

Section VII Total (averaged) Points out of 15 Possible: 14.6

VIII. SUPPORT FOR STRATEGIC PRIORITIES				(Up to 5 POINTS)
0 points Information not provided	1-2 points Applicant affirms that its program will align with Indiana Academic Standards but does not adequately convey how that will occur	3-4 points Applicant provides concrete examples of how its program will align to Indiana Academic Standards (e.g., collaborative planning between regular classroom teachers and extended-learning-time staff; evidenced-based software used for literacy support)	5 points Strong evidence (multiple strategies) provided supporting extended-learning-time program's alignment with Indiana Academic Standards via routine coordination of planning, PD and academic efforts between program and school/district staff where students attend	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4				
Comments: Concrete examples of program alignment to Indiana Academic Standards provided, but description of how the program will be coordinated with PD for the program staff is lacking. Applicant mentions core subject areas, but alignment with afterschool program is vague.				

IX. SUSTAINABILITY PLAN				(Up to 5 POINTS)
0 points Information not provided	1 point Outlines existing partnerships and a general plan for sustaining program levels beyond the grant.	3 points Outlines existing partnerships and potential partnerships; and identifies potential future funding sources (e.g., general funds/Title I)	5 points Outlines existing partnerships, expanding partnerships & potential partnerships; provides a well-conceived plan for sustaining program levels through increased local capacity and/or future funding sources. Establishes sustainability goal for Year One programming.	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3				
Comments: Potential future sources are not specified, i.e., generally described, and applicant has not provided a Year One sustainability goal.				

X. SAFETY AND TRANSPORTATION				(Up to 5 POINTS)
0 points Information not provided	1-2 point range Provides some general staffing requirements (e.g., criminal background checks) and commits to providing students' transportation home after program	3-4 point range Demonstrates detailed program safety plan (background checks on file/confidential); district/agency staffing requirements met; required parent sign-in/out; MOU provided (if facility not located in school); and safe transportation provided to/from center and home that meets needs of working families	5 points Demonstrates detailed program safety plan (background checks on file/confidential); district/agency staffing requirements met; required parent sign-in/out; MOU provided (if facility not located in school); and safe transportation provided to/from center and home that meets needs of working families; <u>and</u> addresses use of IAN Safety Standards	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4.6				
Comments: Applicant does not address IAN Safety Standards.				

XI. BUDGET FORM/NARRATIVE, DETAILS & SUMMARY	(Up to 5 POINTS)
---	-------------------------

Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, August 2018

0 points	1-2 point range	3-4 point range	5 points
Budget Form (Budget Narrative) not completed by applicant.	Some budget narrative pieces completed, but not all. <i>Examples:</i> (a) key anticipated costs not reflected in budget (e.g., evaluation and PD costs missing); OR (b) budget includes cost items not substantiated in proposal narratives; OR (c) excessive line items for equipment costs (without solid justification and intent to obtain IDOE pre-approval).	Budget narrative includes all anticipated line items (e.g., staffing, PD, evaluation, contracted services; transportation). Narratives adequately explain costs that are aligned to activities described in proposed RFP. Costs appear reasonable and permissible (and some items may require pre-approval by IDOE). Budget Summary is completed correctly and matches costs in Budget Form/Narrative.	Exemplary budget narrative clearly articulates all anticipated line items (e.g., staffing, PD, evaluation, contracted services; transportation). Narratives summarize costs that are clearly-aligned to activities in the proposed RFP. All costs appear reasonable and permissible. No errors on Budget Summary; costs match those in Budget Form/Narrative.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3.3			
Comments: A significant purchase of iPads (equipment) is proposed within the Year 1 Budget and details were lacking in the application to substantiate that purchase and demonstrate the reasonableness of those purchases. This equipment, as well as proposed field trips (<i>Transportation</i>), requires IDOE pre-approval.			

XII. GRANT PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION			(Up to 5 POINTS)
0 points	1-2 point range	3-4 point range	5 points
Not organized in prescribed format. Program Narrative section far exceeded <i>30-page maximum</i> (i.e., 35 or more pages)	Grant materials are provided, but not in the sequence requested. <i>Abstract</i> exceeds 2 pages/ <i>Program Narrative</i> section exceeds 35 pages; Did not double-space/use 12-point font.	Grant materials provided in sequence requested. <i>Abstract</i> and <i>Program Narratives</i> do not exceed maximum (2 pages/35 pages). Proposal double-space/12-pt font; and pages numbered with identifying headers on each page.	Exceptionally well organized with materials provided in sequence requested. <i>Abstract</i> and <i>Program Narratives</i> do not exceed maximum (2 pages/35 pages). Proposal double-space/12-pt font; and pages numbered with identifying headers on each page.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5			
Comments:			

2018–Cohort 9 RFP: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, August 2018

Name of Applicant: **Emma Donnan**

Summary of Averaged Peer Reviewer Scores	Points Possible	Averaged Score of Peer Reviewers
I. Project Abstract	5	3
II. Competitive Priority Points	10	9.6
III. Need for Project	5	4.6
IV. Partnerships/Collaboration	5	3.3
V. Program Design and Implementation	30	24
VI. Professional Development Plan	5	4
VII. Evaluation Plan	15	14.6
VIII. Support for Strategic Priorities	5	4
IX. Sustainability Plan	5	3
X. Safety and Transportation	5	4.6
XI. Budget Narrative	5	3.3
XII. Proposal Organization	5	5
TOTAL POINTS	100 Total Points Possible	83